

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated November 22, 2005. Claims 1-5 remain pending in this application. Claim 1 is the independent claim. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

On the merits, the Office Action rejected Claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tillmans (EP 951068; hereinafter "Tillmans") in view of Beckham et al (U.S. Patent No. 4,604,644; hereinafter "Beckham"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for at least the following reasons.

The combination of Tillmans and Beckham fail to recite or suggest the steps of depositing a first group of alloy soldering bumps on the connecting surface of the first silicon wafer that are separated from one another by an even distance which is sufficiently small to cause joinings during the assembly of the two silicon wafers, and depositing a second group of alloy soldering bumps on the connecting surface of the first silicon wafer, said second group of ally soldering bumps being separated from one another by an distance which is sufficiently large to prevent joinings during the assembly of the two silicon wafers.

Tillman recites a solder ring 3 being deposited by electroplating (see, e.g., Col. 4, line 55 to Col. 6, line 6). This requires complex additional steps of masking and depositing,

N:\UserPublic\WX\Amendments\2006 Amendments\FR020019.pre.doc

or depositing and etching which Applicant's invention expressly seeks to avoid.

Beckham recites uniformly distanced solder terminals 13 forming a sealing ring by adding a dielectric 30 (See, e.g., Figs. 5 and 6). Additionally, Beckham nowhere recites or suggests that the bumps are separated from one another by a distance sufficiently small to cause joinings during assembly or a second group of bumps separated by a distance sufficiently large to prevent joinings during assembly. Thus Applicant respectfully traverses the Office Action's rejection of Claim 1 over Tillmans in view of Beckham for at least the above reasons.

Claims 2-5 depend from independent Claim 1 discussed above and are believed patentable for at least the same reasons. In addition, Applicant respectfully believes Claims 2-5 to be independently patentable and request separate consideration of each claim.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached by telephone at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Aaron Waxler,

Reg. 48,027

(914) 333-9608

October 12, 2006